UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/543,081	10/543,081 07/22/2005 Ole Simonsen		10200.204-US	1176	
	7590 05/18/201 NORTH AMERICA,	EXAMINER			
500 FIFTH AV SUITE 1600		DOUYON, LORNA M			
NEW YORK, N	NY 10110	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/18/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patents-US-NY@novozymes.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/543,081	SIMONSEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Loma M. Douyon	1790	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	f).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
_	lianna with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within two months	a a f tha alata a f
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the state of the proposed amendment (a) They raise new issues that would require further contains. 			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		i L below),	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	, ,,	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. $\overline{\boxtimes}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	112, 1st paragraph rejection of clai	ms 36-39.	•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>18-24, 26-40</u> .		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu of the same reasons as set forth in the final rejection.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
	/Lorna M Douyon/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added proportions for the acidic buffer component in the core in independent claims 18 and 30, which is "20% w/w or more" is nowhere supported in the specification and is therefore considered as new matter. Please note that the specification on page 3, lines 20-21 states that "...more than 20% w/w of the total amount of acidic buffer component present in the granules is present in the core..." However, this does not provide basis for the limitation "the core comprises...20% w/w or more of acidic buffer component." The specification on page 5, lines 28-33 and page 6, lines 18-26, recite the amount of the acidic buffer component in the core, namely: at least 10% w/w; at least 25% w/w, at least 40% w/w, more than 50% w/w..., but no mention of "20% w/w or more". Hence, the added limitations in independent claims 18 and 30 lack literal basis in the specification as originally filed, see Ex parte Grasselli, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983) aff'd mem. 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In addition, the added limitation "wherein the detergent enzyme is selected from the group consisting of oxidoreductases, transferases, hydrolases, lyases, isomerases and ligases" in independent claims 18, 30 and 32, which limitation is not present in the original claims, require further consideration and search.